

	Type	Hits	Search Text	DBs	Time Stamp
1	BRS	497	analyz\$5 near10 (artifact or artefact)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:13
2	BRS	619	produc\$5 near10 (metadata)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/02/24 12:45
3	BRS	632	business near5 intelligence	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2004/05/03 10:22
4	BRS	0	S1 and S2 and S3	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2004/05/03 10:22
5	BRS	1	S1 and S2	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2004/05/03 10:22
6	BRS	1	S1 and S3	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2004/05/03 10:23
7	BRS	10	S2 and S3	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2004/05/03 10:24
8	BRS	1	S1 and S3	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2004/05/03 10:31
9	BRS	9301	(metadata)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/02/24 12:45
10	BRS	1109	business near5 intelligence	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/02/24 12:45
11	BRS	159	S154 and S155	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/02/24 12:45
12	BRS	1079919	artefact or artifact or fact	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/02/24 12:45
13	BRS	91	S156 and S157	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/02/24 12:46
14	BRS	1	(harvest\$4 or collect4) near10 (artefact)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 12:42
15	BRS	604	analyz\$5 near10 (artifact or artefact)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:14
16	BRS	144324	intelligen\$2 or expert	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:15
17	BRS	107	S160 and S161	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:15

	Type	Hits	Search Text	DBs	Time Stamp
18	BRS	9424	(metadata)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:15
19	BRS	1	S162 and S163	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:16
20	BRS	2594	S161 and S163	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:16
21	BRS	1598	access\$4 near5 metadata	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:16
22	BRS	1	S160 and S166	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:17
23	BRS	149983	harvest\$6	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:17
24	BRS	17	S168 and S169	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:17
25	BRS	485	S161 and S166	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 11:22
26	BRS	1598	access\$4 near5 metadata	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 12:42
27	BRS	150004	(harvest\$4 or collect4)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 12:43
28	BRS	29	S171 and S172	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 12:53
29	BRS	80422	query	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 12:53
30	BRS	25	S173 and S174	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/07 14:41
31	BRS	2	"6662188".pn.	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/08 09:20
32	BRS	4	(harvesting or harvester) near10 metadata	US-PGPUB; USPAT; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	2005/03/08 09:21

save temp

Temp SearchSave "TG1307357" stored

? show files; ds

File 15:ABI/Inform(R) 1971-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 ProQuest Info&Learning

File 16:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1990-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 The Gale Group

File 148:Gale Group Trade & Industry DB 1976-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 The Gale Group

File 160:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1972-1989

(c) 1999 The Gale Group

File 275:Gale Group Computer DB(TM) 1983-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 The Gale Group

File 621:Gale Group New Prod. Annou. (R) 1985-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 The Gale Group

File 9:Business & Industry(R) Jul/1994-2005/Mar 04

(c) 2005 The Gale Group

File 20:Dialog Global Reporter 1997-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 The Dialog Corp.

File 476:Financial Times Fulltext 1982-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 Financial Times Ltd

File 610:Business Wire 1999-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 Business Wire.

File 613:PR Newswire 1999-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 PR Newswire Association Inc

File 624:McGraw-Hill Publications 1985-2005/Mar 04

(c) 2005 McGraw-Hill Co. Inc

File 636:Gale Group Newsletter DB(TM) 1987-2005/Mar 07

(c) 2005 The Gale Group

File 810:Business Wire 1986-1999/Feb 28

(c) 1999 Business Wire

File 813:PR Newswire 1987-1999/Apr 30

(c) 1999 PR Newswire Association Inc

File 2:INSPEC 1969-2005/Feb W4

(c) 2005 Institution of Electrical Engineers

File 35:Dissertation Abs Online 1861-2005/Feb

(c) 2005 ProQuest Info&Learning

File 65:Inside Conferences 1993-2005/Mar W1

(c) 2005 BLDSC all rts. reserv.

File 99:Wilson Appl. Sci & Tech Abs 1983-2005/Jan

(c) 2005 The HW Wilson Co.

File 474:New York Times Abs 1969-2005/Mar 06

(c) 2005 The New York Times

File 256:TecInfoSource 82-2005/Jan

(c) 2005 Info.Sources Inc

File 475:Wall Street Journal Abs 1973-2005/Mar 04

(c) 2005 The New York Times

File 583:Gale Group Globalbase(TM) 1986-2002/Dec 13

(c) 2002 The Gale Group

Set	Items	Description
S1	1	AU=ROOKE, W?
S2	11343	HARVEST? (S) (ARTEFACT?? OR DATA??)
S3	87459	METADATA
S4	234881	QUERY OR QUERYING
S5	62	S2 AND S3 AND S4
S6	39	RD (unique items)
S7	7	S2 (S) S3 (S) S4
S8	5	RD (unique items)
S9	34	HARVESTER (S) (ARTEFACT?? OR FACTS??)

S10 87462 METADATA
S11 20760 9 AND S10
S12 2543 (HARVESTER OR HARVESTING) (S) (ARTEFACT?? OR FACT??)
S13 30 S10 AND S12
S14 28 RD (unique items)
S15 464179 BUSINESS (S) INTELLIGEN?
S16 2 S13 AND S15
S17 2 RD (unique items)
S18 1 S14 NOT PY>2001

? save temp

Temp SearchSave "TC1309452" stored

?

S19 1 AU=ROOKE, W?

? t's19/9,k/1

19/9,K/1 (Item 1 from file: 99)

DIALOG(R)File 99:Wilson Appl. Sci & Tech Abs

(c) 2005 The HW Wilson Co. All rts. reserv.

2534117 H.W. WILSON RECORD NUMBER: BAST02155594

Is Your Heater Damaging Your Concrete?

Rooke, Wally ;

Concrete International v. 24 noll (Nov. 2002) p. 37-40

DOCUMENT TYPE: Feature Article ISSN: 0162-4075 LANGUAGE: English

RECORD STATUS: New record

ABSTRACT: The writer discusses the risk of carbonation damage when heaters are used to heat workers and concrete in cold weather. Carbonation occurs when carbon dioxide produced by combustion reacts with bleed water in the concrete, causing the formation of a weak chalky surface layer. Heaters that blow combustion products into the work area will elevate carbon dioxide levels and make carbonation more likely, whereas heaters with a chimney or vent will keep the air warm without adding extra carbon dioxide. Placing a vented heater outside, with the heat entering the work area via ports, also creates a positive pressure inside the building that prevents any buildup in carbon dioxide from construction equipment.

DESCRIPTORS: Carbonation; Concrete construction in winter; Heaters--Design

Rooke, Wally ;

?

18/9,K/1 (Item 1 from file: 15)

DIALOG(R)File 15:ABI/Inform(R)

(c) 2005 ProQuest Info&Learning. All rts. reserv.

02246231 86925432

CORC: a system for gateway creation

Hickey, Thomas B

Online Information Review v24n1 PP: 49-53 2000 ISSN: 1468-4527

JRNL CODE: ONCD

DOC TYPE: Periodical; Feature LANGUAGE: English RECORD TYPE: Fulltext

WORD COUNT: 2534

COMPANY NAMES:

Online Computer Library Center (NAICS:514191)

OCLC (NAICS:514191)

GEOGRAPHIC NAMES: United States; US

DESCRIPTORS: Studies; Libraries; Cooperation; Catalogs; Information retrieval; Internet; Systems development; Data bases

CLASSIFICATION CODES: 9130 (CN=Experimental/Theoretical); 8306 (CN=Schools & educational services); 5250 (CN=Telecommunications systems & Internet communications); 9190 (CN=United States)

PRINT MEDIA ID: 36206

ABSTRACT: CORC is an OCLC project that is developing tools and systems to enable libraries to provide enhanced access to Internet resources. By adapting and extending library techniques and procedures, a self-supporting system capable of describing a large and useful subset of the Web is being developed. CORC is more a system for hosting and supporting subject gateways than a gateway itself and relies on large-scale cooperation among libraries to maintain a centralized database. By supporting emerging **metadata** standards such as Dublin Core and other standards such as Unicode and RDF, CORC broadens the range of libraries and librarians able to participate. Current plans are for OCLC as a full service in July 2000.

TEXT: Thomas B. Hickey: Thomas B. Hickey is Chief Scientist at OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Dublin, Ohio, USA. E-mail: hickey@oclc.org

The goal of the CORC project is to create a system that libraries can use to provide their patrons with effective access to the Web. In this way it is similar to what are often called subject gateways which provide a structured approach to Internet resources, often within a limited range of subjects. CORC's approach to the whole process, however, is different than most gateway projects in several ways:

- large scale cooperative involving thousands of libraries;
- many collections in a single database;
- emphasis on the system and tools;
- international in scope;
- integration with existing library procedures;
- adaptation of traditional library techniques;
- support of hand-crafted pathfinder pages;
- support of multiple **metadata** schemes;

- planned to be self-supporting.

In short, CORC is the result of translating many of the concepts developed by subject gateways into the environment of a large library cooperative. At OCLC we are concentrating on building the most useful system for libraries, which implies a challenging combination of existing and future needs. We do not spend much time on selection criteria - individual or groups of libraries develop those sorts of policies. Our mission is to support what they want to do now and to anticipate their future needs.

Large scale cooperative

OCLC currently serves some 35,000 libraries, 7,000 of which are actively contributing **metadata** to OCLC's traditional service embodied by WorldCat (the OCLC Online Union Catalog), a database of more than 42,000,000 distinct items, 34,000,000 of which are books or monographs of some type. This catalog is based on AACR2[1] and MARC 21[2] with fairly strict rules on what is allowed in it, who can create or edit records and how the records and the entries in the records should be constructed. Currently WorldCat contains references to approximately 100,000 Internet resources, and this number is rapidly growing. The main database is augmented by a database of controlled names and subjects maintained in conjunction with the Library of Congress.

It is this environment of rules and large databases that CORC needs to interact with. Libraries need a system that can accommodate and integrate into their existing databases and systems, while also giving them the new tools to work with electronic resources and the ability to use the **metadata** they produce in new ways that do not depend on MARC 21.

Cooperation in CORC happens on a number of different levels. Librarians using the system interact with us, guiding the requirements and development. We work with existing library consortia and sponsor meetings for face-to-face discussions both between the librarians themselves and with us. We have an electronic discussion list to help them communicate as new rules and techniques are worked out to deal with the problems that electronic resources can present. Within CORC we provide a number of statuses that can be used to route **metadata** within an institution as it moves from initial selection of a resource to final polishing. Support of multiple **metadata** formats (described below) helps foster cooperation between groups within libraries. Once a record is in the database, libraries share the maintenance of it with CORC supplying the infrastructure such as record locks, editors and notification of URL and resource changes. Libraries will be able to create authority records in CORC that can be used in library systems to help with retrieval, and promoted to national authority files as appropriate. We are also actively supporting the development of standards that are critical to making the myriad current and future systems work reliably.

Multiple collections

Subject gateways, almost by definition, concentrate on particular subjects. We see CORC more as a system for creating the **metadata** needed to create subject gateways than as a gateway itself. Each participating library is responsible for setting its own criteria for records to add to the CORC database. Some libraries have joined as groups (such as some of the larger US Army libraries), in which case they often work out these policy decisions among themselves. Classification numbers, subject headings, indications on the records of their interest (this corresponds to traditional library holdings), or other markers added to fields can

identify collections within CORC.

Because of this diversity, the CORC database is richer yet less cohesive than a more focused collection. Libraries, however, have had long experience in making such catalogs work, and we expect that these same techniques will be just as valuable in organizing Internet resources. In addition to fielded retrieval capabilities, CORC offers tools to help construct pathfinders (structured pages of links and descriptions of Web resources) which allow collections to be identified and displayed from the diverse database.

System and tools

This is where most of our software development effort has been concentrated. Probably the most used feature in CORC is the ability to "harvest" a given page and create a preliminary record describing that resource, optionally including DDC classification numbers and keywords extracted from the page. The CORC system itself is built on top of the Mantis[3] toolkit, which in turn is built within the SiteSearch[4] suite of Web and Z39.50 tools. Manipulation of the **metadata** is done in XML; in **fact**, Mantis can be looked at primarily as a generalized XML editing system, driven in large part by XML templates. This makes the system highly configurable, many tasks very easy, and the more difficult tasks, such as supporting multiple **metadata** formats, possible. Another tool we rely on is a **harvesting** program[5] both for the initial **metadata** generation and for subsequent checking of URLs to alert participants of potential link problems.

Internationalization

We are doing a number of things to accommodate multiple languages and scripts. All interactions with CORC are done through standard Web browsers, which are continually improving their language support. Within CORC we are now moving to a Unicode based database and search engine. This will allow the storage and display of any characters that can be entered and displayed in Web browsers. We have plans for "distributed" CORC that would permit more customization of the user interface. Examples of this would be translation of the interface itself into German and mounting local authority files for names or subjects.

All of the newer standards, such as RDF[6] and Dublin Core[7], help internationalization, as it is often easier to adopt a new standard than to change a current one, and these new standards are being developed in an international manner, making them much less parochial than current ones.

Integration with library procedures

One of the primary things libraries want to do with **metadata** about Web resources is to present the resource description to their patrons integrated with information about their current physical resources. This means that they need to export the data in a format their local systems can accommodate, i.e. MARC 21 for most US libraries, although a number are starting to work with Dublin Core in HTML and XML/RDF. Another aspect of this is the need to fit into existing library workflow. One of the ways we do this is to support the addition of a status to each record, selected from the list of Private, New, In-process, In-review and Complete. Libraries can use this status to track the progress of a record as it moves from selection to being fully described. In the future we plan to allow institutions to create their own list of statuses, which will enable them

to label and track collections of records as they move into CORC.
Library techniques

Libraries have been developing techniques for dealing with large bibliographic catalogs for over 100 years, and with electronic bibliographic databases for decades. Many of these techniques remain viable and important for databases being developed now. These include the concepts of authority control, access control, classification, subject description, and cooperation.

Controlled headings in CORC appear as active links to an associated authority record, similar to any database system that points to information rather than repeating it each time it appears. The unique aspects of how libraries do this linking are the scale of the system and the procedures developed to create and maintain the linked authority file. This file contains several million entries of names and subjects and is maintained collectively by libraries on several different systems. Currently all of the authority records in CORC are part of the Library of Congress authority file; however, we plan to support other national authority schemes and to allow member-input authorities which will never become part of any national file. An extension of this is what has been called "access control" which will allow preferred forms of headings to appear in records depending on a user's profile of languages and authority schemes.

Classification also plays a role in CORC. Libraries have long used classification schemes to help arrange books on shelves, but have also successfully employed these systems within catalogs to provide subject access. The Dewey Decimal Classification system[8] is the best known of these systems, although many other systems, such as the Library of Congress classification system[9], enjoy widespread use. CORC incorporates the Scorpion[10] system developed at OCLC. Scorpion analyzes the text of documents and searches a database built from the DDC schedules to suggest DDC numbers describing the document. These numbers then can provide another method of bringing like subjects together for retrieval. The numbers also provide links into the schedules themselves that are in turn linked to Library of Congress Subject Headings[11], the most widespread method of attaching controlled subject headings to **metadata** records.

Pathfinders

The word "pathfinders" has been used in libraries to describe short descriptions of where to look for information in the library about a particular topic. They typically give a list of useful encyclopedias, journals, dictionaries, subject headings, and other pointers to resources available to the library patron. In use, this is very similar to many Web pages that collect links and short explanations of them to help find resources on the Web. CORC's version of pathfinders tries to build on both of these approaches. Libraries can create Web pages containing the standard links and descriptions, but can also include dynamic searches of the CORC Resource Catalog for display on the page. To the end-user, the results of the search are integrated and displayed just as links and descriptions.

The current CORC pathfinder system has some limitations on the range of formatting options it offers, but its major advantage is the ability to share the maintenance of URLs among all the CORC participants. As soon as one institution corrects a URL, then links on pathfinder pages will also be corrected.

Multiple **metadata** schemes

We have been able to mix Dublin Core and AACR2/MARC 21 **metadata** within a single database. This is something of a challenge, as the mappings between these standards are seldom straightforward. We are continuing to work out some of the rough spots, but the concept appears to be working. In spite of the amount of effort it has taken us to make this work, we believe it is one of the most important aspects of CORC. The Dublin Core tends to be simpler in many ways than MARC 21. This makes it easier to offer input forms that are simple and guide users to create records without extensive training.

Many would argue that the complexities of AACR2 and MARC 21 are greater than they need to be. This is undoubtedly so; however, all of them were created for a real problem in bibliographic control. The Web is a complex place, and a simple description scheme just is not going to be adequate to describe all of the resources in it. MARC offers an "escape into complexity" that lets us keep the Dublin Core as simple as possible without sacrificing the functionality needed for a subset of resource description. Even experienced MARC catalogers sometimes find it useful to shift into a Dublin Core view of a record for some operations, while using the MARC view for controlling some of the more subtle points.

As mentioned above, switching between **metadata** schemes is accomplished within the system by manipulating a base description stored in XML. This base description currently has elements of MARC, Dublin Core and a number of "administrative" **metadata** elements combined into one record. Each of the parts of the system which expect to work with a particular format, however, sees just that subset of the XML record that makes sense to them and lower levels of the Mantis system take care of merging and managing the fuller data.

Self-supporting system

This is a key aspect every system needs to achieve if it is to continue in operation in a meaningful way. OCLC is an organization supported almost entirely by libraries' creation and use of **metadata**. As we integrate CORC into our current operations, we expect to develop a pricing structure that will continue this. In its simplest form, OCLC pricing is based on rewarding contributions to databases and charging for use of them, whether on a transaction-by-transaction basis or by subscriptions. Web resources have different characteristics than the physical resource **metadata** that OCLC is accustomed to dealing with, but we believe that the fundamental model will carry over.

One aspect of making CORC self-supporting is OCLC's record use policy. Basically, this gives institutions completely free use of any records that they create within OCLC, but there are restrictions on the use of records created by others. For example, one library could not extract records created by another and start providing a commercial service based on them.

Another aspect is that the CORC database as a whole will probably not be available free on the Web for anyone to access. We will be making it available, probably as part of OCLC's FirstSearch service, as well as providing Z39.50 access to it for libraries.

Conclusion

Few dispute that careful selection and description are important to providing subject-based access to Internet resources. CORC is creating the structure needed for large-scale description of these resources. Its emphases are on the application of library techniques and cooperation for

the creation of a large database of these descriptions. Within this structure we are creating a coherent and, eventually, comprehensive tool to support the creation of **metadata** for electronic resources. Currently there are some 200 libraries participating and we plan to gradually open it to the group of 7,000 cataloging libraries after it becomes a production system in the summer of 2000.

Notes

1 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (1998), 2nd ed., Revision, American Library Association, Chicago, IL.

2 Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, MARC Standards, <http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/>

3 Shafer, K., Mantis Home Page, <http://purl.oclc.org/mantis/>

4 OCLC Online Computer Library Center, OCLC SiteSearch, <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/site.htm>

5 Shafer, K., Kilroy Home Page, <http://purl.oclc.org/kilroy/>

6 W3C Technology and Society Domain, Resource Description Framework (RDF), <http://www.w3.org/RDF/>

7 Dublin Core **Metadata** Initiative, The Dublin Core: A Simple Content Description Model for Electronic Resources, <http://purl.org/DC/>

8 OCLC Forest Press, Dewey Decimal System Home Page, <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/fp/index.htm>

9 Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, LC Classification Schedules and Manuals from CDS, <http://lcweb.loc.gov/cds/classif.html>

10 Shafer, K., Scorpion Home Page, <http://purl.oclc.org/scorpion/>

11 Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, Tools for Authority Control - Subject Headings, <http://lcweb.loc.gov/cds/lcsh.html>

THIS IS THE FULL-TEXT. Copyright MCB UP Limited (MCB) 2000

...ABSTRACT: relies on large-scale cooperation among libraries to maintain a centralized database. By supporting emerging **metadata** standards such as Dublin Core and other standards such as Unicode and RDF, CORC broadens...

...TEXT: procedures;

- adaptation of traditional library techniques;

- support of hand-crafted pathfinder pages;

- support of multiple **metadata** schemes;

- planned to be self-supporting.

In short, CORC is the result of translating many...

...cooperative

OCLC currently serves some 35,000 libraries, 7,000 of which are actively contributing **metadata** to OCLC's traditional service embodied by WorldCat

(the OCLC Online Union Catalog), a database...

...them the new tools to work with electronic resources and the ability to use the **metadata** they produce in new ways that do not depend on MARC 21.

Cooperation in CORC...

...present. Within CORC we provide a number of statuses that can be used to route **metadata** within an institution as it moves from initial selection of a resource to final polishing. Support of multiple **metadata** formats (described below) helps foster cooperation between groups within libraries. Once a record is in...

...definition, concentrate on particular subjects. We see CORC more as a system for creating the **metadata** needed to create subject gateways than as a gateway itself. Each participating library is responsible...

...built within the SiteSearch[4] suite of Web and Z39.50 tools.

Manipulation of the **metadata** is done in XML; in **fact**, Mantis can be looked at primarily as a generalized XML editing system, driven in large...

...highly configurable, many tasks very easy, and the more difficult tasks, such as supporting multiple **metadata** formats, possible. Another tool we rely on is a **harvesting** program[5] both for the initial **metadata** generation and for subsequent checking of URLs to alert participants of potential link problems.

Internationalization...ones.

Integration with library procedures

One of the primary things libraries want to do with **metadata** about Web resources is to present the resource description to their patrons integrated with information...

...of Congress Subject Headings[11], the most widespread method of attaching controlled subject headings to **metadata** records.

Pathfinders

The word "pathfinders" has been used in libraries to describe short descriptions of...

...one institution corrects a URL, then links on pathfinder pages will also be corrected.

Multiple **metadata** schemes

We have been able to mix Dublin Core and AACR2/MARC 21 **metadata** within a single database. This is something of a challenge, as the mappings between these...MARC view for controlling some of the more subtle points.

As mentioned above, switching between **metadata** schemes is accomplished within the system by manipulating a base description stored in XML. This base description currently has elements of MARC, Dublin Core and a number of "administrative" **metadata** elements combined into one record. Each of the parts of the system which expect to...

...meaningful way. OCLC is an organization supported almost entirely by libraries' creation and use of **metadata**. As we integrate CORC into our current operations, we expect to develop a pricing structure...

...by-transaction basis or by subscriptions. Web resources have different characteristics than the physical resource **metadata** that OCLC is accustomed to dealing with, but we believe that the fundamental model will ...

...structure we are creating a coherent and, eventually, comprehensive tool to support the creation of **metadata** for electronic resources. Currently there are some 200 libraries participating and we plan to gradually...

...and Society Domain, Resource Description Framework (RDF),
<http://www.w3.org/RDF/>

7 Dublin Core **Metadata** Initiative, The Dublin Core: A Simple Content Description Model for Electronic Resources, <http://purl.org...>

?

t s14/9,k/28

2003

14/9,K/28 (Item 2 from file: 2)

DIALOG(R)File 2:INSPEC

(c) 2005 Institution of Electrical Engineers. All rts. reserv.

7816844 INSPEC Abstract Number: C2004-02-7210-006

Title: The Dienst-OAI Gateway

Author(s): Harrison, T.L.; Nelson, M.L.; Zubair, M.

Author Affiliation: Old Dominion Univ., Norfolk, VA, USA

Conference Title: Proceedings 2003 Joint Conference on Digital Libraries
p.309-11

Publisher: IEEE Comput. Soc, Piscataway, NJ, USA

Publication Date: 2003 Country of Publication: USA xix+421 pp.

ISBN: 0 7695 1939 3 Material Identity Number: XX-2003-02140

U.S. Copyright Clearance Center Code: 0-7695-1939-3/03/\$17.00

Conference Title: Proceedings 2003 Joint Conference on Digital Libraries

Conference Sponsor: IEEE Tech. Committee on Digital Libraries (TCDL); ACM
SIGIR; ACM SIGWEB; Coalition for Networked Inf. (CNI); DELOS; American Soc.
Inf., Sci. & Technol. (ASIST)

Conference Date: 27-31 May 2003 Conference Location: Houston, TX, USA

Language: English Document Type: Conference Paper (PA)

Treatment: Practical (P)

Abstract: Though the Open Archive Initiative Protocol for **Metadata Harvesting** (OAI-PMH) is becoming the de **facto** standard for digital libraries, some of its predecessors are still in use. Although a limited number of Dienst repositories continue to be populated, others are precariously unsupported. The Dienst Open Archive Gateway (DOG) is a gateway between the OAI-PMH and the Dienst (version 4.1) protocol. DOG allows OAI-PMH harvesters to extract **metadata** records (in RFC-1807 or Dublin Core) from Dienst servers. (7 Refs)

Subfile: C

Descriptors: digital libraries; information retrieval; internetworking;
meta data; network servers; open systems; protocols; records managementIdentifiers: open archive initiative; OAI; Open Archive Initiative
Protocol for **Metadata Harvesting**; digital library; Dienst-OAI gateway;
Dienst repository; Dienst Open Archive Gateway; Dienst protocol; **metadata**
record; Dienst server; Dublin Core

Class Codes: C7210 (Information services and centres); C7250 (Information storage and retrieval); C5640 (Protocols); C6150N (Distributed systems software)

Copyright 2003, IEE

Abstract: Though the Open Archive Initiative Protocol for **Metadata Harvesting** (OAI-PMH) is becoming the de **facto** standard for digital libraries, some of its predecessors are still in use. Although a limited...

...PMH and the Dienst (version 4.1) protocol. DOG allows OAI-PMH harvesters to extract **metadata** records (in RFC-1807 or Dublin Core) from Dienst servers.

...Identifiers: Open Archive Initiative Protocol for **Metadata Harvesting**...

... **metadata** record

?

show files; ds

File 15:ABI/Inform(R) 1971-2005/Mar 07
 (c) 2005 ProQuest Info&Learning
 File 16:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1990-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 The Gale Group
 File 148:Gale Group Trade & Industry DB 1976-2005/Mar 08
 (c)2005 The Gale Group
 File 160:Gale Group PROMT(R) 1972-1989
 (c) 1999 The Gale Group
 File 275:Gale Group Computer DB(TM) 1983-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 The Gale Group
 File 621:Gale Group New Prod.Annou.(R) 1985-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 The Gale Group
 File 9:Business & Industry(R) Jul/1994-2005/Mar 07
 (c) 2005 The Gale Group
 File 20:Dialog Global Reporter 1997-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 The Dialog Corp.
 File 476:Financial Times Fulltext 1982-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 Financial Times Ltd
 File 610:Business Wire 1999-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 Business Wire.
 File 613:PR Newswire 1999-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 PR Newswire Association Inc
 File 624:McGraw-Hill Publications 1985-2005/Mar 04
 (c) 2005 McGraw-Hill Co. Inc
 File 636:Gale Group Newsletter DB(TM) 1987-2005/Mar 08
 (c) 2005 The Gale Group
 File 810:Business Wire 1986-1999/Feb 28
 (c) 1999 Business Wire
 File 813:PR Newswire 1987-1999/Apr 30
 (c) 1999 PR Newswire Association Inc
 File 2:INSPEC 1969-2005/Feb W4
 (c) 2005 Institution of Electrical Engineers
 File 35:Dissertation Abs Online 1861-2005/Feb
 (c) 2005 ProQuest Info&Learning
 File 65:Inside Conferences 1993-2005/Mar W1
 (c) 2005 BLDSC all rts. reserv.
 File 99:Wilson Appl. Sci & Tech Abs 1983-2005/Jan
 (c) 2005 The HW Wilson Co.
 File 474:New York Times Abs 1969-2005/Mar 07
 (c) 2005 The New York Times
 File 256:TecInfoSource 82-2005/Jan
 (c) 2005 Info.Sources Inc
 File 475:Wall Street Journal Abs 1973-2005/Mar 07
 (c) 2005 The New York Times
 File 583:Gale Group Globalbase(TM) 1986-2002/Dec 13
 (c) 2002 The Gale Group

Set	Items	Description
S1	254	(HARVESTING OR HARVESTER) (15N) METADATA
S2	9413032	ACCESS?
S3	164	S1 AND S2
S4	7551445	ARTEFACT?? OR ARTIFACT?? OR FACT??
S5	39	S3 AND S4
S6	25	RD (unique items)
S7	1377274	ATTRIBUTE??
S8	220696	QUERY
S9	10	S5 AND S8
S10	1	S7 AND S9
?		